

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
			1		
10/666,359	09/19/2003	Chi-Chun Chen	2001-1488 / 24061.431	8170	
42717 HAYNES AN	7590 09/04/200 D BOONE, LLP	EXAMINER			
901 Main Street			SMITH, FRANCIS P		
Suite 3100 Dallas, TX 752	202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,		1792			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/666,359		CHEN ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Francis P. Smith	1792		

	Francis P. Smith	1792							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, application are sufficient must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in continion for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time.									
periods:									
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN T MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).									
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL									
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of						
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
AMENDMENTS									
 Interproposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 									
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 									
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.							
NOTE: Amendment to claims 1 and 23 if entered of			ld require at						
least additional considerations and particularly reso 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	lving potential issues under 35 US	C 112/1 paragraph. (S	See 37 CFR						
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):									
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		-	_						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	planation of						
Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-43</u> .									
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	hafara ar an the data of filing a Nic	stice of Appeal will not	he entered						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).									
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.133(d)(1).									
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.									
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other									
/Michael Kornakov/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	/F. P. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 1792								

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the applied reference (Raaijmakers et al. US. 6,348,420 Bt) does not teach plasma intridation or plasma reoxidation as claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Raaijmakers teaches the use of a plasma generator for the purpose of providing excited species (col. 8, lines 36-40). Subsequent deposition, a densification process is performed utilizing IX20 and N radicals (obtained by passing IX2 through a plasma generator) at an anneal/densification temperature of 680 C (i.e. plasma nitridation/reoxidation) (col. 20, line 64-col. 21, line 4). Regarding claim 25, applicants argue that the claim "clearly requires the plasma reoxidation process occur in the presence of a material selected from the group consisting of CQ, IXQ, and NO*. Claim 25 of the instant application, however, pertains to oxide and nitride layer thicknesses, and thus, applicants' arguments are apparently without merit. Furthermore, Applicants' argument relies on the amendment, which is not entered.